UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

———————

No. 03-6431

———————

CURTIS KENNETH SCOTT,

                                       Petitioner - Appellant,

      versus

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS; RONALD
ANGELONE, Director,

                                       Respondents - Appellees.

———————

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. James C. Cacheris, Senior
District Judge. (CA-01-1501-AM)

———————

Submitted: August 26, 2003   Decided: September 8, 2003

———————

Before WILKINSON and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

———————

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

———————

Curtis Kenneth Scott, Appellant Pro Se. Thomas Drummond Bagwell,
Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

———————

PER CURIAM:

Curtis Kenneth Scott, a state prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his petition filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000). An appeal may not be taken from the final order in a § 2254 proceeding unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue for claims addressed by a district court absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, ___, 123 S. Ct. 1029, 1039 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 534 U.S. 941 (2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Scott has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED

2